Dear Paul, 12/24/73

Started to look at the goodies during lunch. Had to lay indexes aside because some I could not make out with ~~axxxxxx~~ a lay-on 2x magnifier. Some can make out unaided.

In going over this I wondered if there is a good FOI suit vs FBI for you if they withhold from you any indexes like those you just got?

At one point I read something about Ruby's L.D. phone calls and their being withheld. One of the things MF never returned when she decided to cast me out is a full list. I had no copies of some of the things I let her have to copy. She may give to you. tell her you have my o.k. if you want to.

You ask was there a CIA in 1948. There was, earlier, I think 1947.

There are several things here in which Lesar and I will have added interest. One is any CIA interest in publication of any kind within US. Includes in writers, books, etc. Esp. any indication of connection with publishers, etc. Going along with this, any domestic outside-jurisdiction stuff.

Because of our interests in Watergate, we have special, different now, Mexico interests. If there is aaything not included, we should know or see, whichever is easier. Nixon and his gang were hungup on the. Why is not certain. They apparently felt they could get CIA to take heat over it. I think Helms was fired because he naysayed. It is possible Jim or I may be able to identify personnel when you can't, if there is basis for identification. Of a couple. Including contacts.

I haven't read any of the docs yet. On Buchanan, from your description it seems like this is of foreign origin. It is domestic that particularly interests us now.

If the planted story that Hunt spied for LBJ on Goldwater got any play out there, it is a fake. It was not really spying and it was not for LBJ. It was for CIA and it was restricted to that which became or was public, like speech texts, etc. I suspect that Baker and Thompson, both of whom want to spear CIA for Nixon, were behind this.

If you have any interest in Nixon's dealings with Archives, Weicher has a reprint of his Congressional Record stuff on it, including what are described as deeds and some letters and memos. Blue, won't copy well, small type, and available from his office free.

Tad Szulc's book says that Hunt was in Mexico City 10/63. I have not seen, have ordered a copy (The Compulsive Spy). I have a notion that Szulc had his own connections and is axing Hunt for the Agency. His Bay Pigs and Dominican books consistent entirely with CIA interests. Andrew St. George told me that he was fired by NYTimes over early Cuban WG reporting, that he had not just retired. Don t know. Expect Waldron sometime. I'll ask. Szulc's 7/73 NYTimes Sunday mag piece on Hunt had CIA sources. Unusual.

Do you recall any references to any address in Mexico City in Paseo de la Reforma? Presume it may be equivalent of Rockefeller Center.

I suggested that you file any FOI suits out there and that the DC appeals court had undergone a radical change. I have no doubt based on information from Jim that came today. He is away since end last week but will be back soon and we'll discuss. The comment of the chief judge in a Nader case leaves no doubt in my mind that all the others are of the mind I have given them. Warren addressed secrecy in a Drew Pearson Awards speech Jim has, from Congressional Record (Moorhead). What he said isgood.

And Justice is seeking to extend the adverse possibilities of the spectro appeal decision. Jim has their memo on it. In the Nader case about which he wrote and quoted comments by the judges, they actually repeated what they have alleged before, that FOI gives them new rights to suppress. I hope I remember to suggest to Jim that he consider asking Moorhead to call them to a hearing and ask them to explain just how!

Best,